arXiv:cond-mat/9808020v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 3 Aug 1998

Dynamical properties of two doped, coupled Hubbard chains

R.M. Noack
Institut de Physique Théorique, Université de Fribourg, CH-1700 Fribourg, Switzerland

M.G. Zacher, H. Endres, and W. Hanke
Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Würzburg,
Am Hubland, 97074 Würzburg, Germany

Using quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) simulations combined with Maximum Entropy analytic continuation as well as analytical methods, we examine the one- and two-particle dynamical properties of the Hubbard model on two coupled chains at small doping. The behavior of the single-particle spectral weight $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$ as a function of hopping anisotropy $t_\perp/t$ at intermediate interaction strength is dominated by the transition from one-band behavior at large $t_\perp/t$ to two-band behavior at small $t_\perp/t$, although interaction effects such as band-narrowing, a shift of spectral weight to higher energies in the unoccupied antibonding band and reflected structures due to short-range antiferromagnetic correlations are also present. A single-particle gap is resolved in the intermediate $t_\perp/t$ Luther-Emery phase using Density Matrix Renormalization Group calculations. The dynamical spin and charge susceptibilities show features of the expected bonding-band Luttinger liquid behavior, as well as higher-energy features due to local excitations between the chains at large $t_\perp/t$, and evolve towards the behavior of two uncoupled chains as $t_\perp/t$ is reduced. For the one hole, large $t_\perp/t$ case, we make a detailed comparison between the QMC data and an approximation based on local rung states. At isotropic coupling and somewhat larger doping, we find that the dispersion of the single-particle bands is essentially unrenormalized from that of the noninteracting system, and that the spin and charge response functions have features also seen in random-phase-approximation calculations.

PACS numbers: 71.10.Fd,79.60.-i,75.40.Gb,78.20.Bh

I. INTRODUCTION

In the last five years, there has been much experimental and theoretical interest in systems of pairs of strongly correlated spin–1/2 chains.[1] Materials such as $SrCu_2O_3$[2] $LaCuO_{2.5}$[3], and $Sr_{14}Cu_{24}O_{42-\delta}$[4] contain Cu–O planes which are periodically distorted leading to magnetically isolated two–chain Cu_2O_3 ladders with approximately isotropic magnetic coupling. These materials are spin–liquid insulators, i.e. they have short–range antiferromagnetic order and a gap in the spin excitation spectrum. Recently, the Vanadium-based materials CaV_2O_5, MgV_2O_5 and α'–NaV_2O_5 have been proposed to contain V–O structures similar to the Cu–O ladder structures.[5] While CaV_2O_5 and MgV_2O_5 are spin liquid insulators,[6,7] NaV_2O_5 is a one-dimensional antiferromagnet that undergoes a spin-Peierls transition.[8] The organic copper compound $Cu_2(C_5H_{12}N_2)_2Cl_4$ also appears to be a two-chain ladder material with antiferromagnetic spin-liquid properties.[9] Many of the magnetic properties of these undoped, insulating materials such as the presence and size of the spin gap, the magnetic susceptibility, and the magnetic excitation spectrum, are well–described by the Heisenberg model on an isolated ladder.[10,11,1] However, interladder coupling has been argued to be important for the MgV_2O_5 material,[7] and a frustrating next-nearest-neighbor interaction as well as a larger interchain than intrachain coupling for $Cu_2(C_5H_{12}N_2)_2Cl_4$.[12]

There have also been attempts to synthesize doped ladder materials. Hiroi and Takano[3] have succeeded in doping the material $LaCuO_{2.5}$ by substituting Sr for La. While the doped material shows a finite spin gap and metallic behavior at low temperatures, there is no transition to a superconducting state, which had been suggested theoretically.[13–16] However, band structure calculations indicate that this material probably has a substantial three-dimensional coupling between the chains which would make an isolated ladder picture invalid.[17,18] The $Sr_{14}Cu_{24}O_{42-\delta}$ material has been doped with Ca[19] and Ca and La.[20] At low doping, the spin gap present in the insulating parent compound persists and the resistivity becomes more metallic. At high doping levels and high pressures (3 GPa), the composition $Sr_{0.4}Ca_{13.6}Cu_{24}O_{41.84}$ undergoes a superconducting transition at $T_c = 12\text{K}$.[4] Anomalously, the transition temperature drops rapidly if the pressure is further increased. One issue that remains unclear is the extent to which the spin gap persists in the high-pressure superconducting composition. Mayaffre *et al.*[21] have found low-lying spin excitations in the Cu-O ladders in the normal state of the superconducting composition $Sr_2Ca_{12}Cu_{24}O_{41}$ using ^{63}Cu-NMR measurements, perhaps indicating two-dimensional behavior in the high–pressure superconducting phase.

Although the α'–NaV_2O_5 material was originally thought to consist of charge-disproportionated one-dimensional V-O chains, recent X-ray diffraction measurements and band structure calculations[22] suggest that it may also be a doped ladder system. The material would then have one electron per V–O–V rung, corresponding to a quarter-filled conduction band, and an interchain hopping that is two to three times the intrachain hopping. A quarter-filled two-chain ladder system with large interchain hopping can form an effective one-dimensional antiferromagnet via the interrung magnetic coupling of electrons in the rung bonding state.

There is growing evidence that a spin-liquid state like that found in the ladder materials is closely connected to the physics of the high-T_c superconductors. For example, the high–T_c compounds show signs of a spin gap above the Néel temperature and above the superconducting transition temperature at small doping.[23] The "stripe phases" of the two-dimensional CuO_2 planes in the high–T_c cuprates,[24] which recently have received considerable attention, are in some sense, ladder–like structures. Also, the copper–oxide–based ladder materials are clearly closely related to high–T_c materials, since the ladder-like arrangements of Cu-atoms are produced by line defects in CuO_2 planes.

The success of the two-chain Heisenberg model calculations at explaining the magnetic properties of the insulating materials has lead to the consideration of the two–chain Hubbard and t–J models as a starting point for the doped materials. In fact, predictions of possible properties based on these models predated the existence of doped materials. The most interesting of these predictions was the possible existence of a spin–gapped superconducting state with a $d_{x^2-y^2}$–like order parameter in isotropic or near-isotropic materials at low doping.[13–16] While the presence of superconductivity in the $Sr_{0.4}Ca_{13.6}Cu_{24}O_{41.84}$ material seems to bear out this prediction, the extent to which isolated ladder models are directly applicable to doped materials is not yet clear. The assumption of isolated ladders is probably not justified in the doped $LaCuO_{2.5}$ material, and the absence of a spin gap in $Sr_{0.4}Ca_{13.6}Cu_{24}O_{41.84}$ does not fit in with the picture obtained from the two–chain models. Within the two–chain Hubbard model, the relative strength of the superconducting correlations, which can at most follow a power law decay in one dimension, is quite sensitive to the model parameters, especially the doping level and the hopping anisotropy.[25] Since these parameters also vary from material to material, it is crucial to explore fully the dependence of a wide variety of properties of isolated ladder models on them. Here we will consider the behavior of the single and two–particle dynamical response functions of the two–chain Hubbard ladder as a function of doping and hopping anisotropy.

The Hamiltonian for a ladder consisting of two coupled chains of length L can be written

$$\begin{aligned} H = & -t \sum_{i,\lambda\sigma} (c^\dagger_{i,\lambda\sigma} c_{i+1,\lambda\sigma} + \text{h.c.}) - t_\perp \sum_{i,\sigma} (c^\dagger_{i,1\sigma} c_{i,2\sigma} + \text{h.c.}) \\ & + U \sum_{i\lambda} n_{i,\lambda\uparrow} n_{i,\lambda\downarrow}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\lambda = 1, 2$ numbers the chains and $i = 1 \ldots L$ the rungs of the ladder, t is the hopping matrix element within a chain, and $t_\perp$ the hopping matrix element between the chains.

There has been much work published in the last few years on the behavior of the one-band Hubbard model on ladder systems. One important approach is a weak-coupling method in which the ground state properties of the system are investigated as a function of $t_\perp$ and U starting from the limit of weak U, using renormalization group techniques (see, for example, Refs. 26,27). Particularly relevant for realistic two-chain model calculations is the phase diagram of Balents and Fisher[28], which is calculated in the limit $U \to 0+$, but for arbitrary values of $t_\perp$. The resulting phases can be classified by the number of gapless spin and charge modes within a bosonization picture. Since symmetric and antisymmetric ($k_\perp = 0$ and $k_\perp = \pi$) modes are possible between the chains, there are 9 possible phases, labeled CmSn in Ref. 28, with $m = 0, 1, 2$ the number of gapless charge and $n = 0, 1, 2$ the number of gapless spin modes. For example, the C1S0 phase has one gapless charge mode and a spin gap. This classification scheme has become widely used to describe the phases of one-dimensional coupled-chain systems in general since it provides a useful common notation. Of the nine phases possible in this classification scheme, seven are present in the weak-coupling phase diagram of Ref. 28.

One phase of particular interest occurs for most of the region of the phase diagram for which two bands cross the Fermi energy, i.e. $t_\perp/t < 1 + \cos\pi\langle n\rangle$ for the infinitely large noninteracting system. The lightly to moderately doped isotropic system falls within this region. This phase has one gapless charge mode and a finite spin gap (C1S0), and is analogous to a one-dimensional Luther-Emery liquid. A Luther-Emery liquid has power-law decaying charge-density-wave correlations (CDW) and singlet superconducting correlations whose relative strength is governed by a non-universal parameter.[29–31] With dominant superconducting correlations, the Luther-Emery liquid is a one-dimensional analog of a superconductor, with long-range superconducting order possible given three-dimensional crossover behavior at low temperatures in the real materials.

Numerical studies of the two-chain Hubbard model using the density-matrix renormalization group (DMRG) technique[15,32] show that for a realistic value of the Coulomb interaction, $U = 8t$, the doped system does indeed exhibit a spin gap and metallic behavior, i.e. a vanishing charge gap, in approximately the same region of the $t_\perp$-$\langle n\rangle$ phase diagram as the C1S0 phase in the weak coupling calculation of Balents and Fisher.[28] In addition, there is a direct correlation between the strength of the pair-pair correlation function and the size of the spin gap.[15] The pair order parameter possesses a modified $d_{x^2-y^2}$ symmetry and the pair correlation decays as a power law. These results are consistent with those for a t-J model in the small J/t region where the strong U mapping of the Hubbard model applies.[16] However, the pairing correlation function does not seem to decay slowly enough for isotropic coupling between the chains in order for the superconducting correlations to be the dominant correlations.

Dynamical response functions are important both because they can be directly probed by experimental techniques and because they provide a detailed picture of the excitation spectra at different energy scales, which can often be understood qualitatively or quantitatively through various theoretical pictures or approximations. In particular, the single particle spectral weight function $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$ can be measured directly in photoemission or inverse photoemission experiments, and the two–particle response can be probed using, for example, inelastic neutron–scattering experiments.

Previously, work on the dynamical excitations of the doped two-chain system has concentrated mostly on the t–J model. In Ref. 33, the photoemission spectra and dynamical spin and charge excitations in the half–filled and lightly doped t–J ladder were studied using exact diagonalization. The starting point of large interchain J was used to understand many features of the spectra and the isotropic case was studied extensively. In Ref. 34, the single-particle spectral weight of the lightly doped isotropic t–J ladder was studied using exact diagonalization, with an emphasis on magnetic features present in the single–particle spectrum, and the effect of an interchain Coulomb repulsion. Recently, Riera, Poilblanc and Dagotto have considered the the effect of the anisotropy on the photoemission spectrum in both the Hubbard and t–J models using exact diagonalization.[35] Endres *et al.*[36] studied both the single particle and two–particle dynamical correlation functions of the half–filled Hubbard model using quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) techniques and a Maximum Entropy analytic continuation (MaxEnt), emphasizing the behavior as a function of the hopping anisotropy, and making a comparison to various analytic calculations. The purpose of the present work is to extend the QMC/MaxEnt calculations to the doped case. Some of the work is contained in unpublished form in Ref. 37, and a few of the results were published in preliminary form as part of a conference proceedings.[38]

Here we will calculate both the single–particle spectral weight function, $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$, and the dynamical two–particle spin and charge susceptibilities, $\chi_s(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ and $\chi_c(\mathbf{q},\omega)$. It is important to examine both types of correlation functions in order to make contact with the weak–coupling phase diagram in which, in general, well–defined quasiparticles do not exist, but the phases can be understood in terms of bosonic spin and charge excitations. The single–particle spectral weight makes contact with the original band structure and its evolution with interaction, and the two–particle dynamical correlations contain information on the nature of the low-lying bosonic magnetic and charge excitations of the system. The single–particle spectral weight function is defined in the Lehmann representation as

$$A(\mathbf{k},\omega) = \frac{1}{Z}\sum_{l,l'} e^{-\beta E_l}(1+e^{-\beta\omega})|\langle l|c_{\mathbf{k},\uparrow}|l'\rangle|^2 \cdot \delta(\omega-(E_{l'}-E_l)), \qquad (2)$$

where Z is the partition function, $|l>$ is the exact many-body eigenstate with the energy E_l, β is the inverse temperature $1/k_BT$ and $c_{\mathbf{k},\sigma} = \sum_{i,\lambda} c_{i,\lambda\sigma} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{R}_{i,\lambda}}/\sqrt{2L}$. Throughout this paper, we will use the notation $\mathbf{k} = (k_\perp, k)$ for momenta, where the transverse component, $k_\perp$, can take on the values 0 and π, and k denotes the component parallel to the chains. We use the grand-canonical Quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) algorithm to determine the expectation values of the correlation functions in imaginary time, and invert the spectral theorem

$$G(\mathbf{k},\tau) \equiv \langle c_{\mathbf{k},\uparrow}(\tau)c^\dagger_{\mathbf{k},\uparrow}(0)\rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\tau\omega}}{1+e^{-\beta\omega}} A(\mathbf{k},\omega)d\omega \qquad (3)$$

using the Maximum Entropy analytic continuation method (MaxEnt).[39] In order to achieve high resolution, we use a likelihood function which takes the error–covariance matrix of the QMC data and its statistical inaccuracy consistently into account[40], and incorporate various moments of the spectral weight.[41] While the fermion sign problem is present, we have chosen system parameters, i.e. U/t, filling $\langle n\rangle$, and lattice size L so that low temperatures can be reached with sufficient accuracy. The results presented here are based on QMC data with good statistics, i.e. averages over 10^5 updates of all the Hubbard–Stratonovich variables result in $G(\mathbf{k},\tau)$'s with absolute errors less than or of the order of 5×10^{-4}.

The two-particle correlation functions are defined similarly in the Lehmann representation,

$$\chi_{s,c}(\mathbf{q},\omega) = \frac{i}{Z}\sum_{l,l'} e^{-\beta E_l}(1-e^{-\beta\omega})|\langle l|O_{s,c}(\mathbf{q})|l'\rangle|^2 \cdot \delta(\omega-(E_{l'}-E_l)), \qquad (4)$$

with $O_s(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\mathbf{p}}(c^\dagger_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q},\uparrow}c_{\mathbf{p},\uparrow} - c^\dagger_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q},\downarrow}c_{\mathbf{p},\downarrow})$ and $O_c(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\mathbf{p},\sigma} c^\dagger_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q},\sigma}c_{\mathbf{p},\sigma}$. The calculation in imaginary time and the analytic continuation are analogous to the calculations for $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$.

Although the QMC results are relatively high resolution, some low-energy properties such as single–particle and spin gaps are at an energy scale of the order of $J = 4t^2/U$, and are not resolvable with QMC/MaxEnt. In order to complement the QMC calculations, we will also present some Density Matrix Renormalization Group[42] (DMRG) results for low-energy gaps and static correlation functions.[15] The DMRG can provide very high resolution results for such quantities, but cannot yet provide information on the full dynamical properties.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we will examine the general evolution of both $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$ and

$\chi_{s,c}(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ as a function of $t_\perp/t$ at $U/t = 4$ and moderate doping, $\langle n\rangle = 0.94$, i.e. two holes on a 2×16 lattice. We emphasize making contact with the band transition as a function of $t_\perp/t$ as well as the weak–coupling phase diagram. DMRG calculations of the single–particle gap and the static spin structure factor will be used to resolve low-energy features. In Sec. III, the case of one hole ($\langle n\rangle = 0.9875$ on a 2×16 lattice) will be treated at $U/t = 8$ and large $t_\perp/t = 2.0$ Here a direct comparison will be made with a local rung approximation (LRA), a strong-coupling expansion based on the states of an isolated rung[36,10,33]. We find very good agreement for the two–particle as well as the single–particle dynamical correlation functions. Finally, we will treat the isotropic system, $t_\perp/t = 1.0$ at a higher doping $\langle n\rangle = 0.875$ and $U/t = 4.0$ in Sec. IV. This case is interesting since the system is somewhat further from half–filling, and the antiferromagnetic correlations are weaker. We will compare the two–particle dynamical correlations with Random Phase Approximation (RPA) calculations, and the single–particle spectral weight function with the noninteracting bands and with slave boson mean–field calculations. We find that the dispersion of the bands is essentially unrenormalized from that of the noninteracting system and that the RPA calculations lead to a qualitative understanding of some features of $\chi_s(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ and good quantitative agreement with most of the features $\chi_c(\mathbf{q},\omega)$. The points in the zero-temperature $\langle n\rangle$–$t_\perp/t$ phase diagram at which we make calculations are shown in Fig. 1 as points in the $U = 0$ phase diagram.

II. EVOLUTION WITH $t_\perp$/t

In this section, we discuss the evolution of the single-particle spectral weight $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$, and the dynamic spin and charge susceptibilities $\chi_s(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ and $\chi_c(\mathbf{q},\omega)$, with decreasing $t_\perp/t$ at low doping, $\langle n\rangle = 0.94$. We choose intermediate coupling, $U/t = 4$, and show results on a 2×16 lattice for which $\langle n\rangle = 0.94$ corresponds to a doping of two holes from half-filling. The inverse temperature, $1/T \equiv \beta = 8t$ is low enough so that the system is effectively in the ground state for this system size, to within the resolution of the QMC calculations and the MaxEnt analytic continuation.

As we will see below, the behavior of $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$ is dominated by the band transition as a function of $t_\perp/t$. The dispersion of the bands is only moderately renormalized by band-narrowing interaction effects, and the one-band to two-band transition takes place at $t_\perp/t = 1.6$, a significantly smaller value than the noninteracting ($L\to\infty$) value of $t_\perp/t = 1.98$. There are also additional features present due to the interactions.

We display $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$ in Figs. 2–5 for $t_\perp/t = 2.2, 1.6, 1.0$ and 0.2. The band transition can be clearly seen. For $t_\perp = 2.2$, only the $k_\perp = 0$ bonding band lies below the Fermi level, and the dispersion of the clearly defined peak follows that of the $U = 0$ band (shown as a dotted line). The Fermi wave vector within this band is given by $k_F^b = \pi\langle n\rangle = 15\pi/16$. In the antibonding ($k_\perp = \pi$) channel, the spectral weight is in the unoccupied $\omega > 0$ portion of the spectrum and lies mostly above the noninteracting band. The total spectral weight is small, and while the peaks have approximately the dispersion of the noninteracting band, they are shifted to higher energy and are quite broad. In addition, there are some reflected structures in this channel near $k = 0$ probably due to short-range antiferromagnetic order.

At $t_\perp/t = 1.6$ (Fig. 3) the interacting system is just below the band transition. The bonding band is almost completely occupied and the antibonding band is almost completely unoccupied, leading to $k_F^a \approx 0$ and $k_F^b \approx 15\pi/16$. There is band flattening in both bands near the Fermi points, leading to a higher density of states in these regions. This high density of states near the Fermi level separated by a wave vector $\mathbf{Q} = (\pi,\pi)$ was argued in Ref. 25 to strongly enhance $d_{x^2-y^2}$–like pairing correlations in this regime. According to the weak coupling phase diagram of Ref. 28 and the numerical DMRG calculations of Ref. 15, this phase is a C1S0 phase, a Luther-Emery liquid with a spin gap. Structures resembling the reflected bands present at half–filling are also seen, probably reflecting the short-range antiferromagnetic order present close to half-filling.

As $t_\perp/t$ is further reduced, as seen in Fig. 4, the occupation of the antibonding band increases and that of the bonding band decreases. Below the Fermi level ($\omega < 0$), the dispersion of the bands follows the noninteracting dispersion well. There is some flattening of the bands at the Fermi points and reflected structures can also be seen.

At $t_\perp/t = 0.2$, Fig. 5, the bonding and antibonding bands are almost equally occupied, and the distribution of spectral weight is very similar in the two bands. There is a lightly weighted broad reflected structure in the $\omega > 0$ portion of the spectral weight, and a broad incoherent background at low energies for $\omega < 0$ in both $k_\perp$ channels. At these parameters, $2k_F^b \approx \pi$, a condition which leads to a C1S2 phase (i.e. gapless spin and charge excitations) in the weak-coupling phase diagram of Ref. 28.

It is interesting to determine to what extent the characteristics of the low-energy behavior are reflected in $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$. Since some of the phases predicted as a function of $t_\perp$ are well-understood one-dimensional phases such as a Luttinger liquid (C1S1) and Luther-Emery liquid (C1S0) phases, characteristics of these phases should be present. In principle, a Luttinger liquid phase should lead to two separate anomalous peaks in $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$ for k near k_F, corresponding to the separated spin and charge modes.[43] The Luther-Emery phase should lead to a single-particle gap of the order of the spin gap, as well as an anomalously diverging peak corresponding to the charge mode.[31] However, resolving the spin-charge separated peaks with numerical methods has proven to be rather difficult, even for the numerically easier case of the one-dimensional

Hubbard model.[44] There are no separately resolvable spin and charge peaks or resolvable single-particle gaps in Figs. 2–5. The DMRG, however, can be used to resolve gaps at quite small energy scales.

In Fig. 6, we display the finite-size scaling of the single-particle gap

$$\Delta_1 = \mu^+ - \mu^- = E_0(N+1) + E_0(N-1) - 2E_0(N) \tag{5}$$

calculated on 2×8 to 2×32 lattices with open boundary conditions. Here $\mu^+ - \mu^-$ is the jump in the chemical potential at the Fermi surface, and $E_0(N)$ is the ground state energy with minimum $|Sz|$ and N electrons at a particular system size, and the overall density $n = N/L$ is kept fixed for different system sizes. The lines are least-squares fits to quadratic polynomials in $1/L$. We have chosen somewhat larger doping, $\langle n \rangle = 0.875$ than the QMC calculations in order to have more system sizes available for the finite-size scaling, and $U/t = 8$. The values $t_\perp/t = 1.3, 1.6$ have been chosen to be just below and just above the two-band to one-band transition, as determined from DMRG calculations of the spin gap and the pair correlations.[15] As can be clearly seen, there is a finite value of Δ_1 at $L \to \infty$ for $t_\perp/t = 1.3$, in agreement with the prediction for a Luther-Emery system in Ref. 31. For $t_\perp/t = 1.6$, Δ_1 scales to zero as $L \to \infty$, as is predicted for the Luttinger liquid (C1S1) phase which should be present at these parameters.

The behavior of the spin and charge modes can more directly examined through the dynamical spin and charge response $\chi_s(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ and $\chi_c(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$. We exhibit QMC/MaxEnt calculations of these quantities in Figs. 7–10 for the same parameters as in Figs. 2–5.

For $t_\perp/t = 2.2$, Fig. 7, the system is predicted to be a Luttinger liquid (C1S1 phase) in the bonding band since the antibonding band is completely unoccupied. Therefore, one would expect to see gapless spin and charge excitations in the $q_\perp = 0$ channel at $q = 2k_F^b = 2\pi\langle n \rangle$. The presence of such low-lying excitations at $q = \pi/8$ (where the wave vector has been wrapped back to the first Brillouin zone) can be seen in Fig. 7 (a) and (c). The dispersion is consistent with a linear increase, as would be expected in a Luttinger liquid, although the the resolution is not sufficient to resolve different spin and charge velocities. The presence of a spin correlation at $\mathbf{q} = (0, 2k_F^b = \pi/8)$ can also be seen as a small peak in the $q_\perp = 0$ branch of the spin structure factor, $S(\mathbf{q})$, plotted in Fig. 11. Here we have calculated $S(\mathbf{q})$ at $T = 0$ on a 2×32 lattice using the DMRG. Note that the much more heavily weighted $q_\perp = \pi$ branch of $S(\mathbf{q})$ is flat, indicating very strong antiferromagnetic correlations across a rung of the ladder, but very short–range correlations along the legs.

The majority of the spectral weight, however, is associated with high-energy features in the $q_\perp = \pi$ channel for both $\chi_s(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ and $\chi_c(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$. For $\chi_s(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$, Fig. 7(b), there is a dispersive, cosine-like band with larger spectral weight near $q = 0$ and a minimum near $q = \pi$. This dispersive band is also seen in the half-filled system[36] and can be understood in terms of a local rung approximation in which a triplet excited state on a rung is delocalized in a cosine band of width $J = 4t^2/U$. This picture, valid for large $t_\perp/t$ at half-filling, provides a good description of the $q_\perp = \pi$ spin excitations because of the proximity of the system to half-filling and due to lack of low-lying spin excitations in the antibonding channel. The size of the $q_\perp = \pi$ spin gap is determined by the band separation $t_\perp - t_{\perp c}$ where $t_{\perp c}/t \approx 1.6$ for these parameters.

The $q_\perp = \pi$ charge susceptibility, Fig. 7(d), is also very similar to that of the half-filled system. There is a strongly weighted peak at $q = 0$ at $\omega/t \approx 7$ which can be understood in terms of a local charge excitation on a rung. As q is increased, this charge excitation becomes a broad band with decreasing spectral weight with increasing q. The peak in intensity has a dispersion which increases with increasing q. There is, however, a small amount of spectral weight spread over a region with a lower bound which decreases with increasing q. This broadening of the region of charge excitations can be understood principally in terms of particle-hole excitations between the single-particle bands, although vertex effects do also play a role. A more detailed description of these effects for the half–filled case is given in Ref. 36.

At $t_\perp/t = 1.6$, the system is just inside the doped spin-liquid (C1S0) phase, and a spin gap is present. As can be seen in Fig. 8 (a), the $q_\perp = 0$ branch of $\chi_s(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ has gained a little in spectral weight relative to $t_\perp/t = 2.2$ and the band of charge excitations has become narrower in ω. While there is some spectral weight near $\omega = 0$ and $q = \pi/8$, as was seen for $t_\perp/t = 2.2$, here one would expect a gap in the spin excitations. The finite resolution here, however, precludes resolving a gap of the order of $0.1t$ or less. In the $q_\perp = \pi$ branch, Fig. 8 (b), the cosine-like dispersive band is still present and has the same bandwidth, $2t$, as for $t_\perp/t = 2.2$, but is shifted downwards in ω so that the $q = \pi$ peak is close to $\omega = 0$. This shift of the band is expected since the gap in the $q = \pi$ excitations in the large $t_\perp$ regime is determined by the band separation, and should go to zero at the band transition. The minimal spin gap, of order $0.1t$, should occur at $\mathbf{q} = (\pi, k_F^b + k_F^a = 15\pi/16)$, but the limited resolution in $\mathbf{q}$ and in ω does not allow us to unambiguously resolve the position of of the minimum, or the size of the gap. The spectral weight at $q = \pi$ is larger than for $t_\perp/t = 2.2$, Fig. 7 (b).

The behavior of the spin structure factor $S(\mathbf{q})$, shown in Fig. 11, reflects the qualitative change in the spin correlations due to the band transition. For $t_\perp/t = 1.6$, the peak at $\mathbf{q} = (0, \pi/8)$ present for $t_\perp/t = 2.2$ which was due to the $2k_F^b$ correlations in the C1S1 phase has disappeared, as one would expect. There is a larger amplitude in the $q_\perp = 0$ correlations, reflecting stronger intrachain antiferromagnetic correlations, and a relatively broad peak at $q = k_F^b + k_F^a = 15\pi/16$ has developed.

This peak reflects short-range incommensurate spin fluctuations present in the C1S0 phase.[32]

The dynamic charge susceptibility, Fig. 8 (c) and (d), has only minimal qualitative changes from the $t_\perp/t = 2.2$ case. In the $q_\perp = 0$ channel, $\chi_c(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ has a minimum in the dispersive band near $q = \pi/8$, with a dispersive band which is somewhat broader and more heavily weighted than for $t_\perp/t = 2.2$. In the $q_\perp = \pi$ branch, the structures are similar to the $t_\perp/t = 2.2$ case, but with somewhat broader peaks, and, as expected, are also shifted to lower ω due to the smaller separation of the bonding and antibonding bands. Note that selection rules forbid there being any spectral weight at $\mathbf{q} = (0,0)$ for both $\chi_c(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ and $\chi_s(\mathbf{q},\omega)$.

As $t_\perp/t$ is further lowered to 1.0, Fig. 9 and 0.2, Fig. 10, $\chi_s(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ and $\chi_c(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ evolve towards a form expected for two uncoupled chains. One can see that as $t_\perp$ is lowered, the $q_\perp = 0$ and $q_\perp = \pi$ branches of both the spin and charge susceptibilities become similar to one another, until at $t_\perp/t = 0.2$, the branches are almost identical to within our resolution. At $t_\perp/t = 1.0$, one sees that the dispersion of the peaks in $\chi_s(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ has minima near $\omega = 0$ at $\mathbf{q} = (0,0)$ and near $\mathbf{q} = (\pi,\pi)$, with heavy spectral weight at $\mathbf{q} = (\pi,\pi)$. The isotropic system should be in a spin-gapped C1S0 phase. The existence of a spin gap has been confirmed numerically with DMRG calculations[15] for $U/t = 8$ and is of the order of $0.08t$ at $\langle n\rangle = 0.9375$. Again, this spin gap is smaller than the resolution available in the QMC/MaxEnt calculations.

The charge susceptibility, Fig. 9 (c) and (d), has a broad, heavily weighted dispersive band with a minimum at $q = 0$ and $\omega \approx 0$ and a maximum near $q = \pi$ in the $q_\perp = 0$ branch. In the $q_\perp = \pi$ branch, there is also a dispersive band with a broad peak whose position increases monotonically with increasing q. However, the minimum position at $q = 0$ is at $\omega \approx 3t$. In addition, there are more lightly weighted dispersive structures at smaller ω that reach $\omega = 0$ at a number of finite wave vectors in both $q_\perp$ branches. The overall spectral weight distribution and the position of these minima can be understood by comparing with Random Phase Approximation (RPA) calculations of $\chi_c(\mathbf{q},\omega)$. Such a comparison will be carried out in detail for a larger doping, $\langle n\rangle = 0.875$ in Sec. IV, where we have better resolution data on a larger lattice.

At $t_\perp/t = 0.2$, weak-coupling theory[28] predicts that the system is close to the line at which the bonding band is half-filled at $U = 0$, and Umklapp processes in the bonding band lead to a C1S2 phase, i.e. a vanishing of the spin gap. DMRG calculations have shown the spin gap vanishes along this line even at large interaction, $U/t = 8$. Figs. 10(a) and (b) are consistent with two vanishing spin modes, to within the resolution of the QMC. Both the $q_\perp = 0$ and the $q_\perp = \pi$ branches have a sine-like dispersion with minima at $q = 0$ and near $q = \pi$. The spectral weight distribution is similar in the two bands, except for somewhat larger weight near $\mathbf{q} = (\pi,\pi)$, due to the remaining antiferromagnetic correlations, and zero weight at $\mathbf{q} = 0$ due to selection rules. The dispersion and weight distribution in each channel are similar to that of the 1D Hubbard model.[50] The charge and spin velocities of the 1D Hubbard model, obtained from Ref. 46, are indicated in Fig. 10 as lines at low q. As can be seen, the low-q dispersion agrees well with this 1D value for both $\chi_s(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ and $\chi_c(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ in both $q_\perp$ channels.

III. ONE HOLE, LARGE INTERCHAIN COUPLING

For small doping and $t_\perp \gg t$, it is possible to approximate the properties of the two coupled Hubbard chains by starting from a local rung-singlet picture. For vanishing doping, the single-particle spectral weight can be calculated by considering transitions between a state with one hole and a state with two holes. A one-hole state with parallel momentum k is given in the LRA[36] as $|\psi_1(k)\rangle = \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} e^{ik\ell}|\ell\rangle/\sqrt{L}$. The expectation value of the energy for this state in first order perturbation theory is

$$E_1(k) = \langle\psi_1(k)|H|\psi_1(k)\rangle = (L-1)E_a - t_\perp + 2tA\cos k, \tag{6}$$

with $A = (1+E_b/2t_\perp)^2/(2+E_b^2/2t_\perp^2)$. The lowest energy state thus occurs for $k = \pi$ with the wave vector

$$|\psi_0^{\mathrm{1hole}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}}\sum_{\ell=1}^{L}(-1)^{\ell}|S_1\rangle|S_2\rangle\ldots|\downarrow_\ell\rangle\ldots|S_L\rangle, \tag{7}$$

and energy $E_1^{\mathrm{1hole}} = (L-1)E_a - t_\perp - 2tA$. The wave function for this state is a product of rung eigenstates, all of which have a momentum $k_\perp = 0$ between the chains. Therefore, the total perpendicular momentum $K_\perp$ is zero. As discussed in Ref. 36 (see Fig. 7), it is energetically most favorable to remove a particle from a two–particle rung state $|S_\ell\rangle$ in the $k_\perp = 0$ channel. The removal of a second particle from the one–hole ground state will predominantly take place on a rung with two particles and have $k_\perp = 0$. (The removal of the particle from $|\downarrow_\ell\rangle$ will also be a $k_\perp = 0$ process, since the state with no particle has $k_\perp = 0$.) Therefore, we will consider only processes in the $k_\perp = 0$ channel here. The LRA state for two holes can then be written as

$$|\psi^{\mathrm{2hole}}(k)\rangle = \frac{1}{B_N}c_{k,k_\perp=0,\downarrow}|\psi_0^{\mathrm{1hole}}\rangle, \tag{8}$$

where B_N is a normalization constant. Without loss of generality, we can choose the direction of the spin so that the z component of the total spin vanishes. After some calculation, one finds that the dispersion in the $k_\perp = 0$ channel for $\omega < 0$ is given by

$$\omega^{\mathrm{1hole}}(k) = -2tA^{\mathrm{1hole}}(1+\cos k), \tag{9}$$

with $A^{\rm 1hole} = (1 + E_b/2t_\perp)^2/(2 + E_b^2/2t_\perp^2)$. The factor $A^{\rm 1hole}$, which renormalizes the band, is identical to that obtained in the half-filled case (i.e. a transition from a half-filled LRA state to a one-hole LRA state). In other words, to first order in t, the effective bandwidth does not change with doping near half-filling.

In Fig. 12, we compare the QMC and LRA results on a 2×16 system with $U/t = 8$ and $t_\perp/t = 2.0$ for $k_\perp = 0$, part (a), and $k_\perp = \pi$, part (b). The average particle density, $\langle n \rangle = 0.96875$, corresponds to a doping of one hole on a 2×16 lattice. The inverse temperature, $\beta t = 8$, is the maximum that could be reached due to the fermion sign problem, but is nevertheless low enough so that the 2×16 system is effectively in the ground state, to within the resolution of the MaxEnt data.

The solid line in the $k_\perp = 0$ channel shows the results from the LRA calculation. As in the half-filled case, the dispersion is in very good agreement with the dispersion of the main peak in the QMC data, even at $t_\perp/t = 2.0$. Note that the $U = 0$ band, shown as a dotted line, has a larger width and does not fit the peaks as well. There is a broad band between $\omega \approx 4t$ and $\omega \approx 8t$ in the $k_\perp = \pi$-channel whose bandwidth is the same as that of the band in the $k_\perp = 0$ channel to within error bars. This band is displaced upwards significantly from the $U = 0$ band, indicating substantial deviation from the noninteracting band structure. Because the resolution of the MaxEnt method becomes less accurate for larger ω values, the dispersion for $k_\perp = \pi$ is not as easily discerned as for the corresponding band in the $k_\perp = 0$ channel. While most of the spectral weight is contained in these dispersive bands, there are indications of a broad incoherent background, similar to those found at half-filling, in both $k_\perp$ channels.

In Fig. 13 we show the charge and spin susceptibilities for the same parameters as above. Almost all of the spectral weight in the spin response function is contained in the $q_\perp = \pi$ channel. One can understand this result by considering the Lehmann representation of $\chi_s(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ in the LRA picture. Since for $q_\perp = 0$ the operator $O_s(\mathbf{q})$ commutes with the LRA Hamiltonian H_0, the matrix elements $\langle l|O_s(\mathbf{q})|l'\rangle$ are diagonal in l and l', the susceptibility $\chi_s((q_\perp = 0, q), \omega)$ is therefore exactly zero when H_I is neglected (i.e. for $t_\perp \gg t$). In the $q_\perp = \pi$ channel, most of the spectral weight lies in a band with a cosine-like dispersion (Fig. 13(b)) between $\omega \approx 1.9t$ and $\omega \approx 0.8t$. A band with identical form to within the error bars is found in the half-filled case[36], and can also be identified with magnon excitations with the LRA. The spin gap in the $q_\perp = \pi$ channel is the same as the half-filled value, $\Delta E_S^{\rm half-filling}/t = 0.81 \pm 0.02$ to within the resolution of the QMC/MaxEnt data. The weak-coupling phase diagram[28] predicts a Luttinger-liquid-like phase with gapless charge and spin excitations (C1S1) in this parameter regime, i.e. no spin gap. There is some indication of weakly weighted low-lying spin excitations in the $q_\perp = 0$ channel of the spin susceptibility shown in Fig. 13(a), supporting the weak-coupling phase diagram even for the relatively strong coupling $U/t = 8$. Note that this feature is present with a larger weight for $\langle n \rangle = 0.94$ and $U/t = 4$, as we have seen in Fig. 7(a).

In Figs. 13(c) and (d), we exhibit the charge susceptibility $\chi_c(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ for the same parameters. For momentum $q_\perp = \pi$, shown in Fig. 13(c), there is a broad, q-independent excitation at $\omega \approx 9t$. This excitation can be understood in the LRA picture in terms of charge excitations on one rung which are also present in the half-filled case. Due to the fermion sign problem, which becomes worse with doping, it is not possible to obtain as high a resolution as for the half-filled system. The excitation spectrum for $q_\perp = 0$ is, however, quite interesting in that we find a well-defined $\omega \to 0$-Mode for $q \to 0$ with velocity $v_c/t = 0.59 \pm 0.29$, even though there should be no $q_\perp = 0$ spectral weight within the LRA picture [$O_c(q_\perp = 0, q)$ commutes with the unperturbed Hamiltonian H_0, analogously to $O_s(q_\perp = 0, q)$ for the spin excitations]. The presence of low-lying charge excitations indicates that a metal-insulator transition takes place quite close to half-filling.

IV. ISOTROPIC INTERCHAIN COUPLING AT HIGHER DOPING

In the following, we consider isotropic interchain coupling $t_\perp = t$, which is relevant for many ladder materials, at a larger doping, $\langle n \rangle = 0.875$. The results are on a 2×64 lattice with $U/t = 4$ and at an inverse temperature $\beta t = 5$, which is the lowest temperature we could reach for these parameters given the size of the average sign.

A. The single-particle spectral weight

In Fig. 14, we exhibit the single-particle spectral weight $A(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$ for this system. Two different structures are apparent in the data. Most of the spectral weight is contained in a cosine-band-like structure that extends from $\omega \approx -2.8t$ to $\omega \approx 1.6t$ in the $k_\perp = 0$ channel and from $\omega \approx -0.7t$ to $\omega \approx 4.4t$ in the $k_\perp = \pi$ channel. There is also a broad, incoherent background in both $k_\perp$ channels for photoemission ($\omega < 0$) as well as for inverse photoemission ($\omega > 0$) that contains much less spectral weight. A similar incoherent background has also been found in studies of the one- and two-dimensional Hubbard model[45].

The dispersive structure which contains the majority of the spectral weight has the cosine-like form of the noninteracting band structure, with a bandwidth that agrees well with the $U = 0$ bandwidth, shown as a solid line, for $k_\perp = 0$, Fig. 14(a), except for some deviation in the $k_\perp$ channel near $k = \pi$. In order to try to understand band renormalization effects due to interactions, one can compare with slave-boson mean-field theory techniques.[47,48]

However, one finds a narrowing of the noninteracting bands of about 10%,[49] and a dispersion which does not fit the QMC results as well as the dispersion of the noninteracting bands. For higher energies, especially near $k = \pi$ in the $k_\perp = \pi$ channel, the agreement between the QMC data and the noninteracting dispersion becomes worse. One can understand this discrepancy in terms of a *spin-wave-shake-off* effect, which occurs analogously to the half-filled case. At half-filling, a self-consistent diagrammatic calculation of the self-energy within a SDW state leads to additional contributions to the spectral weight, especially in the center of the magnetic Brillouin zone, i.e. at $k = 0$ and $k = \pi$ in both $k_\perp$ channels. These additional contributions are due to diagram classes involving transverse magnetic fluctuations.[51] For the doped system, there are still short-range antiferromagnetic spin correlations which are reminiscent of spin-density-waves, leading to a spin-wave-shake-off effect in the doped system near half-filling.

B. Charge and Spin Response

Here we compare the spin and charge excitations of the doped isotropic system to calculations within the Random Phase Approximation (RPA). This will allow us to gain some qualitative understanding of many of the features of the charge response especially. The basic idea of the RPA is that the bare Coulomb interaction $V^0_{\sigma,\sigma'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega_n)$ is replaced by an effective interaction $V^{\mathrm{RPA}}_{\sigma,\sigma'}(\mathbf{q}, \omega_n)$ in which screening processes present in the strongly correlated many-body system are taken into account. Analytically summing the ladder diagrams one obtains for the spin and charge response function:

$$\chi^{\mathrm{RPA}}_{c,s}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = \frac{\chi_0(\mathbf{q}, \omega)}{1 \pm U\chi_0(\mathbf{q}, \omega)}, \tag{10}$$

with

$$\chi_0(\mathbf{q}, \omega_n) = -\frac{1}{N\beta}\sum_{\mathbf{k},\nu_n} \mathbf{G}^{\sigma}_{0,\mathbf{k}}(\nu_n - \omega_n)\mathbf{G}^{\sigma}_{0,\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}(\nu_n). \tag{11}$$

We show the RPA result for the charge susceptibility, calculated on a 2×64 lattice with $U/t = 4$, $\langle n\rangle = 0.875$, and isotropic $t_\perp = t$ in Fig. 15. Parts (a) and (c) show the result of the RPA calculation for $T \to 0$ for both values of $q_\perp$, where the poles of $\chi^{\mathrm{RPA}}_c(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$, i.e. the zeros of the denominator in Eq. (10) are indicated by diamond symbols (◇) and the magnitude of the imaginary part of $\chi^{\mathrm{RPA}}_c(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ by the density of the shading. Figs. 15 (b) and (d) show the results of the QMC/MaxEnt calculation at $\beta t = 5$. The qualitative agreement between the RPA calculation and the QMC/MaxEnt results is quite good, to within the noise caused by the finite resolution and finite temperature of the QMC/MaxEnt method. In the $q_\perp = 0$ branch, there is a well-defined mode that extends from $\omega = 0$ at $q = 0$ to $\omega \approx 5t$ at $q = \pi$. By taking the slope of the maximum weighted portion of this mode as $q \to 0$, we obtain a charge velocity $v_c/t = 1.74 \pm 0.17$. The band-like structures in the RPA calculation, which contain most of the spectral weight, clearly have a similar form to those in the QMC/MaxEnt data. In addition, there is also a broad spectrum below the well-defined bands, including gapless excitations at wave vectors $q_1 = 17\pi/32$ and $q_2 = 25\pi/32$, which are also present in the QMC/MaxEnt data, although not so well-defined due to the finite resolution of the QMC/MaxEnt and the relatively small amount of spectral weight in these modes.

The $q_\perp = \pi$ spectra, shown in Figs. 15 (c) and (d), are also quite similar for the RPA and QMC/MaxEnt calculations. In this channel, most of the spectral weight for both methods is contained in a well-defined band-like structure which extends from $\omega \approx 2.5t$ at $q = 0$ to $\omega \approx 6t$ at $q = \pi$. For the RPA calculation, there is a broad spectrum of excitations below this band with gapless excitations at $q_3 = 11\pi/32$ and $q_4 = 28\pi/32$. The QMC data, Fig. 15(d), again show very similar structures.

One can understand the source of the gapless excitations at q_1 and q_2 in the $q_\perp = 0$ channel and q_3 and q_4 in the $q_\perp = \pi$ channel in terms of the noninteracting band structure of the system. In Fig. 16, we show the bonding ($k_\perp = 0$) and the antibonding ($k_\perp = \pi$) bands defined by $\varepsilon(k)$ for $U = 0$ with the Fermi wave vectors k_{F_1} and k_{F_2} within each band indicated. Two gapless intraband and two gapless interband charge excitations are possible given this band structure. The intraband excitations ($q_\perp = 0$) occur for $q_2 = 2\pi - 2k_{F_1}$ within the $k_\perp = 0$ band and for $q_1 = 2k_{F_2}$ within the $k = \pi$ band (wrapping back into the reduced Brillouin zone). The interband transitions ($q_\perp = \pi$) can occur at $q_3 = k_{F_1} - k_{F_2}$ and $q_4 = k_{F_1} + k_{F_2}$. At these four wave-vectors, gapless particle-particle excitations can occur, leading to $\omega = 0$ poles in $\chi^{\mathrm{RPA}}_c(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ and thus the gapless excitations seen in Fig. 15 (a) and (c).

In Fig. 17, we show the QMC results as well as the RPA calculation for the spin susceptibility $\chi_s(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ for the same parameter values as the charge susceptibility discussed above, with the results plotted in a similar manner. While some of the features of the RPA calculation are present, here the qualitative agreement with the QMC results is not as good. There is a single gapless ($\omega \to 0$) mode present in $q_\perp = 0$ channel in the QMC data that increases with increasing q, reaching $\omega \approx 1.5t$ at $q = \pi$. The RPA calculation, in contrast, shows a broad spectrum which extends to $\omega \approx 4t$ at $q = \pi$ with the largest spectral weight contained in two dispersive bands which become gapless at $q_5 \approx 13\pi/32$ and $q_6 \approx 27\pi/32$. The deviation of the RPA results from the QMC calculation is probably due to the following: first, the relatively high temperature of the QMC simulation ($\beta t = 5$) leads to a thermal broadening of the structures so that individual poles could no longer be resolved, even with exact (i.e. with zero statistical error) data. Secondly, it is known from DMRG calculations[32] that there is a spin gap in the isotropic system even for moderate doping. Since the RPA calculation results in a Fermi liquid state, there is no spin gap in the RPA results, whereas in the QMC data, the presence of a spin gap, expected from the DMRG results, could lead to the vanishing of spectral weight at q_5 and q_6.

In the $q_\perp = \pi$ channel, shown in Fig. 17 (c) and (d), the RPA calculation shows gapless excitations at $q_7 \approx 11\pi/32$, $q_8 \approx 20\pi/32$ and $q_9 \approx 28\pi/32$. In the QMC data, one can only clearly see the upper part of the dispersive band that becomes gapless at q_7 and has a value $\omega \approx t$ for $q \to 0$. Most of the spectral weight is, in contrast to the RPA calculation, contained in the $q_\perp = \pi$ channel and is concentrated at $\omega \approx 0.5t$ between $q = 3\pi/4$ and $q = \pi$. The overall dispersion of this structure is somewhat cosine–like, reminiscent of that seen in Fig. 13(b) for small doping and $t_\perp/t = 2$ and thus could be be partially due to the propagation along the ladder of a rung spin-triplet excitations in a spin-singlet background, as described previously in the LRA picture. Therefore, the QMC data possibly show some hints of a spin gap in $\chi_s(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ in both $q_\perp$ channels.

V. CONCLUSION

We have discussed the dynamic single-particle, as well as two-particle (i.e. charge and spin) response of a doped two-chain Hubbard ladder, calculated using QMC and the Maximum Entropy method and concentrating on the regime of small doping. The general evolution of the single–particle as well as the charge and spin response has been investigated for a filling of $\langle n \rangle = 0.94$, corresponding to two holes on a 2×16 lattice at $U/t = 4.0$, an interaction strength equal to the one-dimensional bandwidth. The behavior of the single–particle spectral weight $A(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$ is dominated by a one–band to two–band transition as $t_\perp/t$ is decreased from the highly anisotropic case. There are additional interaction effects such as a flattening of the dispersion near the Fermi level, band narrowing, and reflected bands due to antiferromagnetic correlations which are especially prominent near the band transition. The presence of a single-particle gap when both the bonding and the antibonding bands cross the Fermi surface, while not resolvable within the QMC/MaxEnt data, was confirmed using DMRG calculations.

At large $t_\perp/t$ the dynamical spin and charge susceptibilities show heavily weighted high–energy features corresponding to local magnetic and charge excitations on a rung, as well as more lightly weighted gapless modes corresponding to Luttinger liquid behavior in the bonding channel. The presence of the gapless spin mode is also found in the static magnetic structure factor calculated with the DMRG. As $t_\perp/t$ is lowered, the spin response evolves first to reflect the strong short-range antiferromagnetic correlations at $\mathbf{q} = (\pi, \pi)$, and then evolves to the form of uncoupled one-dimensional chains with similar dispersion and weight in both transverse channels for small $t_\perp/t$. The charge response is consistent with a gapless mode in the $q_\perp = 0$ channel as $t_\perp/t$ is reduced. In the $q_\perp = \pi$ channel, the charge response evolves from a form marked by a high-energy local rung excitation to a form with a low-energy mode with linear dispersion with a weight distribution similar to that of the $q_\perp = 0$ channel as $t_\perp/t$ is reduced.

For the case of one hole at strong interchain coupling, $t_\perp \gtrsim 2t$ and $U/t = 8$, the results are well–described by a Local Rung Approximation (LRA), in which the states of one rung are treated exactly and the interaction between the rungs is treated perturbatively. Both the dispersion and the weight distribution in the effective band structure, given by the single-particle spectral weight $A(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$, is quantitatively well-fit by a LRA calculation in which one or two rung singlets are replaced by states with one hole, and then delocalized into a Bloch band. The $q_\perp = \pi$ dynamic charge and spin susceptibilities are also well-described by an LRA picture in which local rung charge or triplet excitations are delocalized into a band. However, there is a well-defined gapless charge mode in the $q_\perp = 0$ channel of the charge response signifying metallic behavior, while spectral weight for $q_\perp = 0$ is forbidden by selection rules in the LRA picture.

For the isotropic system at moderate doping, $\langle n \rangle = 0.875$, we still find the overall quasi-particle dispersion essentially unchanged. However, a broad incoherent background with a width of several t, that is analogous to similar features observed in the one- and two- dimensional Hubbard models, is found. The dispersion of the quasi-particle-like structure agrees well with that of the $U = 0$ band structure. The general features of the charge susceptibility, including the origin of wave vectors at which gapless excitations occur, can be understood in terms of a Random Phase Approximation (RPA) picture. In contrast, the spin susceptibility shows the signature of short–range antiferromagnetic ordering not present within the RPA picture.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Intensive discussions with D.J. Scalapino and R. Preuss are acknowledged and we thank S. Haas, H. Tsunetsugu and T.M. Rice for helpful conversations. H.E. and W.H. are grateful to the Bavarian “FORSUPRA” program on high T_c research, to the DFG under Grant No. Ha 1537/12-1 and the BMBF Grant No. 05 605WWA 6 for financial support. M. G. Z. acknowledges support from the DFN project Tk598-VA/D3, and R.M.N. was supported by the Swiss National Foundation under Grant No. 20-46918.96. The calculations were performed at the HLRZ in Jülich and at the LRZ München.

---

[1] E. Dagotto and T.M. Rice, Science **271**, 618 (1996).

[2] M. Azuma, Z. Hiroi, M. Takano, K. Ishida, Y. Kitaoka, Phys. Rev. Lett. bf 73, 3463 (1994).

[3] Z. Hiroi and M. Takano, *Nature* **377**, 41 (1995).

[4] M. Uehara *et al.*, J. Phys. Soc. Jap., (1996).

[5] B. Normand *et al.*, Physica C, 1997 AUG, **282**, 1117 (1997).

[6] J.C. Bouloux and J. Galy, J. Solid State Chem. **16**, 385 (1976).

[7] P. Millet *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 5005 (1998).

[8] M. Poussard, A. Casalot, J. Galy and P. Hagemuller, Bull. Soc. Chim. Fr. **11**, 4343 (1967); M. Isobe and Y. Udea, J. Phys. Soc. Jap. **65** 1178 (1996).

[9] G. Chaboussant *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 3046 (1997).

[10] T. Barnes, E. Dagotto, J. Riera and E.S. Swanson, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 3196 (1993).

[11] S.R. White, R.M. Noack and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 886 (1994); B. Frischmuth, B. Ammon and M. Troyer, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 3714 (1997).

[12] C.A. Hayward, D. Poilblanc, and L.P. Lévy, Phys. Rev. B **54** 12649 (1996).

[13] E. Dagotto, J. Riera and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 5744 (1992).

[14] T.M. Rice, S. Gopalan and M. Sigrist, *Europhys. Lett.* **23**, 445 (1993).

[15] R.M. Noack, S.R. White and D.J. Scalapino, *Europhys. Lett.* **30**, 163 (1995); Physica C **270**, 281 (1996).

[16] C.A. Hayward, D. Poilblanc, R.M. Noack, D.J. Scalapino and W. Hanke, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 926 (1995).

[17] B. Normand and T.M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 8760 (1997).

[18] M. Troyer, M.E. Zhitomirsky and K. Ueda, Phys. Rev. B **55**, 6177 (1997).

[19] E.M. McCarron, M.A. Subramanian, J.C. Calabrese, and R.L. Harlow, Mater. Res. Bull. **23**, 1355 (1988); T. Siegrist *et al.*, Mater. Res. Bull. **23**, 1429 (1988).

[20] S.A. Carter *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1378 (1996).

[21] Mayaffre *et al.*, Science **279**, 345 (1998).

[22] H. Smolinski *et al.*, unpublished, cond-mat/9801276.

[23] H. Ding *et al.*, Nature **382**, 51 (1996).

[24] Generic reference on stripes.

[25] R.M. Noack, N. Bulut, D.J. Scalapino and M.G. Zacher, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 7162 (1997).

[26] M. Fabrizio, A. Parola and E. Tosatti, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 3159 (1992); M. Fabrizio, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 15838 (1993).

[27] J. Sólyom, *Adv. Phys.* **28**, 201 (1979).

[28] L. Balents and M.P.A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 12133 (1996); H.H. Lin, L. Balents and M.P.A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 6569 (1997).

[29] A. Luther and V.J. Emery, Phys. Rev. Lett. **33**, 589 (1974).

[30] M. Imada, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 550 (1993).

[31] J. Voit, J. of Phys. Cond. Mat., **8**, 779 (1996).

[32] R.M. Noack, S.R. White and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 882 (1994).

[33] H. Tsunetsugu, M. Troyer, and T.M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 16078 (1994); M. Troyer, H. Tsunetsugu and T.M. Rice, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 251 (1996).

[34] S. Haas and E. Dagotto, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 3718 (1996).

[35] J. Riera, D. Poilblanc and E. Dagotto, unpublished, cond-mat/9804209.

[36] H. Endres, R.M. Noack, W. Hanke, D. Poilblanc and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 5530 (1996).

[37] H. Endres, Ph.D. thesis, Universität Würzburg, 1997.

[38] H. Endres, R.M. Noack, W. Ziegler, and W. Hanke, Physica B **230-232**, 811 (1997).

[39] R.N. Silver, D.S. Sivia, and J.E. Gubernatis, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 2380 (1990), and references therein.

[40] W. von der Linden, R. Preuss and W. Hanke, J. Phys. Cond. Mat. **8**, 3881 (1998).

[41] S.R. White, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 4670 (1991).

[42] S. R. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2863 (1992); Phys. Rev. B **48**, 10345 (1993).

[43] E.H. Lieb and F.Y. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **20**, 1445 (1960); V. Meden and K. Schönhammer, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 15753; J. Voit, J. Phys. Cond. Mat. **5**, 8305 (1993).

[44] M.G. Zacher, E. Arrigoni, W. Hanke and J.R. Schrieffer, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 6370 (1997).

[45] R. Preuss, W. Hanke and W. von der Linden, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1344 (1995).

[46] H.J. Schulz, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **5**, 57 (1991).

[47] L. Lilly, A. Muramatsu and W. Hanke, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1379 (1990).

[48] W. Ziegler, P. Dieterich, A. Muramatsu and W. Hanke, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 1231 (1996).

[49] W. Ziegler, private communication.

[50] R. Preuss, A. Muramatsu, W. von der Linden, P. Dieterich, F.F. Assaad and W. Hanke, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 732 (1994).

[51] J. Altmann, W. Brenig, A.P. Kampf and E. Müller-Hartmann, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 7395 (1995).

FIGURE CAPTIONS

FIG. 1. The $U = 0$ phase diagram in the $t_\perp$–$\langle n\rangle$–plane. In the shaded region, both the bonding and antibonding bands intersect the Fermi level, while in the unshaded region only the bonding band is occupied. On the dashed line, the bonding band is half–filled. The solid points signify parameter values at which we calculate the dynamical properties in this work. The open circles represent points at which we calculate the quasiparticle gap with the DMRG.

FIG. 2. The single-particle spectral weight $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$ for $t_\perp/t = 2.2$, $U/t = 4$ and $\beta t = 8$ on a 2×16 lattice at a filling of $\langle n\rangle = 0.94$. The two $k_\perp$ branches are overlayed on the same plot since they are well-separated in energy, with the open and filled symbols marking the position of the $k_\perp = 0$ and $k_\perp = \pi$ peaks, respectively, and the error bars indicating the width of the peaks. The density of shading indicates the amount of the spectral weight.

FIG. 3. $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$ plotted as in Fig. 2, with the same parameters, except with $t_\perp/t = 1.6$.

FIG. 4. $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$ plotted as in Figs. 2-3, except with $t_\perp/t = 1.0$.

FIG. 5. $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$ plotted as in Figs. 2-4, except with $t_\perp/t = 0.2$ and (a) $k_\perp = 0$ and (b) $k_\perp = \pi$ plotted separately.

FIG. 6. Finite size extrapolation of the quasiparticle gap, calculated using the DMRG for $U = 4$, $\langle n\rangle = 0.9375$, and $t_\perp/t = 1.3, 1.6$.

FIG. 7. (a) and (b), the spin susceptibility $\chi_s(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ and (c) and (d), the charge susceptibility $\chi_c(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ for $t_\perp/t = 2.2$, $U/t = 4$ and $\beta t = 8$ on a 2×16 lattice at a filling of $\langle n\rangle = 0.94$.

FIG. 8. The spin and charge susceptibilities plotted as in Fig. 7, except for $t_\perp/t = 1.6$.

FIG. 9. The spin and charge susceptibilities plotted as in Figs. 7-8, except for $t_\perp/t = 1.0$.

FIG. 10. The spin and charge susceptibilities plotted as in Fig. 7-9, except for $t_\perp/t = 0.2$. The straight lines indicate the spin- and charge velocities of the corresponding 1D Hubbard chain (from Ref. 46).

FIG. 11. The spin structure factor $S(q)$ for $t_\perp/t = 1.6, 2.2$ calculated with the DMRG with $U/t = 4$ and $\langle n\rangle = 0.9375$.

FIG. 12. The single-particle spectral weight $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$ for $t_\perp/t = 2$, $U/t = 8$ and $\beta t = 8$ on a 2×16 lattice at a filling of $\langle n\rangle = 0.96875$ (1 hole). The error bars denote the width of the peak obtained using the Maximum Entropy technique. The dotted lines indicate the dispersion of the noninteracting, $U = 0$ bands, and the solid line in (a) indicates the dispersion obtained from the LRA calculation.

FIG. 13. The spin and charge susceptibilities ($\chi_s(\mathbf{q},\omega)$: parts (a) and (b), $\chi_c(\mathbf{q},\omega)$: parts (c) and (d)) for $t_\perp/t = 2$, $U/t = 8$ and $\beta t = 8$ on a 2×16 lattice at a filling of $\langle n\rangle = 0.96875$ (1 hole). The $q_\perp = 0$ channel is shown in (a) and (c), while the $q_\perp = \pi$ channel is shown in (b) and (d).

FIG. 14. The single-particle spectral weight $A(\mathbf{k},\omega)$ for $t_\perp/t = 1$, $U/t = 4$ and $\beta t = 5$ on a 2×64 lattice at a filling of $\langle n \rangle = 0.8776 \pm 0.0001$. The $k_\perp = 0$ and $k_\perp = \pi$ data are shown in parts (a) and (b), respectively. The solid line represents the dispersion of the noninteracting ($U = 0$) bands.

FIG. 15. The charge susceptibility $\chi_c(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ for isotropic $t_\perp = t$ with $U/t = 4$ on a 2×64 lattice at a filling of $\langle n \rangle = 0.875$. Parts (a) and (c) show the results of the RPA calculation for both $q_\perp$ channels at $T = 0$ (grey-shaded data and diamond $\diamond$ symbols), while parts (b) and (d) show the QMC results for $\beta t = 5$.

FIG. 16. Band structure of the interaction free case ($U = 0$) of a 2×64 system with $t_\perp/t = 1.0$ and a particle density of $\langle n \rangle = 0.875$.

FIG. 17. The spin susceptibility $\chi_s(\mathbf{q},\omega)$ for isotropic $t_\perp = t$ with $U/t = 4$ on a 2×64 lattice at a filling of $\langle n \rangle = 0.875$. Parts (a) and (c) show the results of the RPA calculation for both $q_\perp$ channels at $T = 0$ (grey-shaded data and diamond $\diamond$ symbols), while parts (b) and (d) show the QMC results for $\beta t = 5$.